## **REMARKS**

By the above actions, claims 19, 30 & 38 have been amended and claims 29 & 31-37 cancelled. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested. Entry of this amendment is in order since reduces the number of claims presented for the Examiner's consideration and eliminates the formal grounds for objection and rejection.

Claims 19, 20 & 25-40 were rejected under 35 USC § 112. However, since the clause which formed the basis for this rejection has been deleted, this rejection has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 20 & 25-38 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over the Foster, Yang and Walters et al., while claim 39 has been rejected over these references when viewed in further combination with the Callahan patent and claim 40 when viewed in further combination with the Balogh patent. To the extent that these rejections relate to the claims as now presented, they are inappropriate for the following reasons.

First, it is noted that claim 1 has been amended to incorporate subject matter previously found in now-cancelled claims 29, 31 & 32 with regard to the presence of a spring that pretensions the pump shaft and a guide sleeve which is held by the pump housing surrounding the pump shaft, to which has been added the fact that the guide sleeve extends towards the dispenser head from the pump housing roughly up to the end area of the third sleeve section, and that the spring is mounted on the guide sleeve as described in paragraph [0037]. Additionally, amended claim 1 also now recites the fact that an annular seal is located on an inner side of the guide sleeve in an area of a free end of the guide sleeve so that the annular seal forms a slide guide for the pump shaft, feature that is also described in paragraph [0037].

None of these features which have been added to claim 1 can be found in the Foster patent and it is submitted that the combination of features now recited would not be obvious to add to Foster in the claimed manner based on the disclosures of Yang, Walters et al., Callahan and Balogh, no matter how they might be viewed one in light of the others since none of these references possess the noted characteristics of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections under § 103 should be withdrawn and such action is hereby requested.

Therefore, in the absence of new and more relevant prior art being discovered, this application should now be in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or any new issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating prompt approval of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

David S. Safran

Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C. PO Box 10064 McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone (703) 584 3273

DSS:kmm